

## DR. BRIGGS MUST GO

The Assembly Sustains the Specifications of Error

## BY AN OVERWHELMING VOTE

The Briggs Men Were Beaten From the Start and Gave Up Hope. Some Sensational Speeches.

WASHINGTON, May 31.—The appeal of the prosecution from the verdict of the New York presbytery acquitting Dr. Briggs of the charges against him has been sustained by the general assembly, the vote being as follows: Number of votes cast 40; to sustain the appeal, 29; to sustain in part, 8; total to sustain, 37; not to sustain, 11.

Upon resuming business at 2:30 yesterday afternoon the call of the roll of the assembly was continued. Each delegate, as his name was reached, made a brief explanation of his vote. Prof. John D. Dugfield, of Princeton college, contended that the assembly must deal with Professor Briggs, of Union seminary, precisely as it would deal with John Smith, of Ziontown. It was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith. Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

Dr. Briggs was not a personal question. Every man, he said, was under an obligation to preserve the purity of the church. No critic, higher or lower, could determine what portion of the bible was the word of God. Dr. Briggs had supporters in old and new churches, and the assembly must deal with him as it would deal with John Smith.

## WON BY HOME RULE

Significant Ballot On an Unfavorable Amendment.

## CLEAR MAJORITY OF 52 VOTES.

Mr. Gladstone Hopes to See a Member of the Royal Family in Office in Ireland.

LONDON, May 31.—In the house of commons today Viscount Wellesley, liberal unionist, moved an amendment to the home rule bill that the Irish legislature should not be empowered to grant votes in supply respecting matters upon which they were forbidden to legislate. The amendment was rejected by a vote of 240 to 188.

General Goldsworthy, conservative, moved an amendment to the bill to abolish the office of viceroy for Ireland and substitute a secretary of state. General Goldsworthy said that he hoped to see members of the British royal family residing in Ireland.

## DON'T LIKE NORDHOFF.

The Hawaiian Government After the New York Herald's Correspondent.

SAN FRANCISCO, May 31.—Ex-United States Minister Stevens arrived on the steamer Australia from Hawaii this morning. He was accompanied by his wife and two children. He was met by a large number of people, and he was taken to the hotel.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

## JEFF IN HIS GRAVE

At Last the Old Traitor's Bones Are at Rest

## IN VIRGINIA'S CHIEF CITY.

Flowers Strung on His Coffin by Fair Hands—Scene Attending the Final Ceremonies of Interment.

RICHMOND, Va., May 31.—The Jefferson Davis funeral train arrived here this morning. At the depot the first regiment and the veterans from Lee and Pickett camps were drawn up, while thousands of men, women and children testified the appreciation of the occasion by the most respectful silence. As the casket containing the body was removed to the horseheads were uncovered. The procession proceeded with the visiting posts of veterans from the 12th southern states to the state capital building, where the body was placed in state in the rotunda. Here it remained until 3 o'clock, and it is estimated that 25,000 people viewed the bier. During the hours set apart for the school children, 6,000 of these alone marched past and dropped floral offerings at the foot of the casket. At 3:30 o'clock the body was removed to the canon drawn by six white horses and the line of march was taken up for Hollywood. Houses along the line were almost without exception decorated in black and the national state and confederate flags were either floating to the breeze. The streets along the route, yards and windows of the dwelling were packed with the people. Nothing of the tumultuous character marked the day or program of the cortege, and the whole city seemed to be in mourning.

In the procession first came Gen. John R. Gordon, chief marshal, and staff of some fifty prominent confederate officers, then the infantry under Col. Henry Jones, headed the line, and was followed by the artillery with three batteries, the Howitzers of Portsmouth and Norfolk light artillery battalions, all under command of Maj. W. E. Simons. Four troops of cavalry followed, commanded by Col. W. F. Wickham. They were the Stuart horse guards, Ashby light horse, Chesterfield and Albemarle troops. These were followed immediately by the catafalque, behind which came the caissons in which were seated Mrs. Jefferson Davis and Governor McKinney, Miss Winnie Davis and Mayor Ellison and Mr. and Mrs. Hayes. Women and children scattered flowers along the route in front of the catafalque, and the bells of the city tolled while the procession moved. A number of old confederate battle flags were borne in the procession, while a number of caissons were filled with flowers. At the grave the Stowaway band of Staunton played a funeral dirge. The Rev. William M. McKim read a selection of scripture, and the Rev. Dr. H. W. Landrum then read the hymn, "How Firm a Foundation," which was sung by the crowd. Dr. Hope offered prayer. The Rev. Dr. C. S. Lorton, of Norfolk, pronounced the benediction and the casket was lowered into the grave. After the bugle signal came taps and the infantry fired a salute and the services were over. The ladies then decorated the graves of 16,000 confederate soldiers.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

## SPECTATORSHIP GOES UNDER

MacKay's Great Scheme Results in a Disastrous Failure.

## AT LAST THE OLD TRAITOR'S BONES

Are at Rest

Flowers Strung on His Coffin by Fair Hands—Scene Attending the Final Ceremonies of Interment.

RICHMOND, Va., May 31.—The Jefferson Davis funeral train arrived here this morning. At the depot the first regiment and the veterans from Lee and Pickett camps were drawn up, while thousands of men, women and children testified the appreciation of the occasion by the most respectful silence. As the casket containing the body was removed to the horseheads were uncovered. The procession proceeded with the visiting posts of veterans from the 12th southern states to the state capital building, where the body was placed in state in the rotunda. Here it remained until 3 o'clock, and it is estimated that 25,000 people viewed the bier. During the hours set apart for the school children, 6,000 of these alone marched past and dropped floral offerings at the foot of the casket. At 3:30 o'clock the body was removed to the canon drawn by six white horses and the line of march was taken up for Hollywood. Houses along the line were almost without exception decorated in black and the national state and confederate flags were either floating to the breeze. The streets along the route, yards and windows of the dwelling were packed with the people. Nothing of the tumultuous character marked the day or program of the cortege, and the whole city seemed to be in mourning.

In the procession first came Gen. John R. Gordon, chief marshal, and staff of some fifty prominent confederate officers, then the infantry under Col. Henry Jones, headed the line, and was followed by the artillery with three batteries, the Howitzers of Portsmouth and Norfolk light artillery battalions, all under command of Maj. W. E. Simons. Four troops of cavalry followed, commanded by Col. W. F. Wickham. They were the Stuart horse guards, Ashby light horse, Chesterfield and Albemarle troops. These were followed immediately by the catafalque, behind which came the caissons in which were seated Mrs. Jefferson Davis and Governor McKinney, Miss Winnie Davis and Mayor Ellison and Mr. and Mrs. Hayes. Women and children scattered flowers along the route in front of the catafalque, and the bells of the city tolled while the procession moved. A number of old confederate battle flags were borne in the procession, while a number of caissons were filled with flowers. At the grave the Stowaway band of Staunton played a funeral dirge. The Rev. William M. McKim read a selection of scripture, and the Rev. Dr. H. W. Landrum then read the hymn, "How Firm a Foundation," which was sung by the crowd. Dr. Hope offered prayer. The Rev. Dr. C. S. Lorton, of Norfolk, pronounced the benediction and the casket was lowered into the grave. After the bugle signal came taps and the infantry fired a salute and the services were over. The ladies then decorated the graves of 16,000 confederate soldiers.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

## GIVEN A HARD BLOW.

Judge Taft Decides Against Detroit's Street Railway Co.

## IN ITS CASE WITH THE CITY.

Franchise was Held to Be More Liberal than Which May Be Revoked by the Common Council.

Detroit, Mich., May 31.—Mayor Finck has won his fight against the Street Railway company. The decision of Judge Taft, United States circuit judge, was read in the federal court this morning. It holds that the ordinance of 1879 was invalid.

The case arose as follows: In 1863 the Detroit common council granted to the Detroit City Railway company a franchise, extending over a period of thirty years. In 1879 the ordinance was amended, in consideration of certain concessions on the part of the company, to extend for thirty years from that date—giving it continued existence until 1909. This right was first transmitted to the Detroit Street Railway company, the successor of the Detroit City Railway company, and later to the Citizens' Street Railway company, the present corporation.

Mayor Finck began a crusade against the street railway company. He discovered what he believed to be a fatal flaw in the amended ordinance giving the company the right to the streets of Detroit until 1909. It was pointed out to him that the ordinance had no legal right to extend the franchise beyond the original life of the company. This was just the point for which Mayor Finck had been seeking, and he was not slow in availing himself of it. When he started out to find an attorney to take charge of his case, however, he claimed to be badly hampered by the fact that the railway company had retained most of the more able lawyers of the city. He at last retained C. A. Kent, with Benton Hanchett of Saginaw, as counsel.

The first point was won by the company in securing the removal of the case from the city circuit to the United States court on the ground of local prejudice. This move was bitterly fought on behalf of the city, but a later motion to remand was denied by the United States court judges. The case was heard before Judges Taft and Swan. Judge Swan being absent several weeks ago, and the decision which was reached today has since been pending.

Judge Taft's opinion is very long. He devotes many pages to a statement of the case and then says: These four questions arise: 1. Did the council, on November 14, 1879, have power to extend the rights of the franchise for fourteen years beyond its corporate life? 2. Conceding the invalidity of the ordinance are the parties in part delict—equally at fault—so that equity will not interfere to restore the city rights it parted with by an act without its fault? 3. Does the investment of so much capital in good faith of the validity of this ordinance entitle the city to amend the charter? These points are discussed as follows: 1. The city's power to grant is asserted by defendants to exist under the charter of 1846, and the city's right to amend the charter is asserted by the city. The city's right to amend the charter is asserted by the city. The city's right to amend the charter is asserted by the city.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

## DISASTROUS WRECK.

Four Persons Are Injured and Considerable Stock Is Killed.

## COLUMBUS' LOSS.

Over \$100,000 Worth of Property Destroyed by Fire Yesterday.

COLUMBUS, Ohio, May 31.—Fire broke out in the Case Manufacturing company's lumber yard shortly after 10 o'clock tonight and spread with great rapidity, soon devouring the Neil Wheel works and the Case Manufacturing company's plant. The fire at 12 o'clock this morning is not under control. The loss to the Neil works is estimated at \$50,000, with \$15,000 insurance. The Case Manufacturing company's loss will reach \$150,000, with probably \$80,000 insurance.

Resurrecting 800,000 Bodies. KANSAS CITY, Mo., May 31.—There is excitement here over the resurrection of the remains of people buried fifty years ago in a graveyard in the center of the city. It is the intention of the city authorities to make a park out of the grounds and the remains of over 300,000 persons will be removed to a burial ground outside of the city limits. It is feared the removal of the bodies will cause the spread of the worst diseases. Hundreds of victims of the deadly typhoid fever, of smallpox and of every other disease are not only buried, but in some cases packed in the crowded graveyard. The city authorities have been called on to stop the work.

Her Skull Was Crushed. HUNTSVILLE, N. Y., May 31.—The body of a young woman, who had probably been murdered, has been found floating in Mud creek, about five miles southeast of this town. It was identified as that of Fannie A. Wyckoff, who has been missing from her employer, Jacob Haysler, a farmer, for three weeks. An autopsy showed that the temporal bone was crushed in the brain. The examination of the lungs showed that the girl was dead before she was placed in the water. There is no doubt that the girl was murdered, but for what reason and by whom is shrouded in mystery.

Loss Work and More Pay. NEW YORK, May 31.—The Jersey Central railroad is now in this city awaiting a reply from President J. Rogers Maxwell to a demand for a new schedule of wages which has been presented to him. This committee represents the conductors, brakemen, train men and telegraphers forming the Railway Trainmen's association, and is headed by Chief Ramsey of the National Brotherhood of Telegraphers. Nearly all the employees work twelve hours a day, and they want an eleven hour work day, with extra pay for overtime.

Found a Skeleton. INDIANAPOLIS, Ind., May 31.—While tearing down and clearing away the old Star hotel at Center Point, this county, the workmen were startled when an old bone was unearthed a short distance under ground. The bone was opened and a ghastly human skeleton was brought to view. The citizens are greatly stirred up over the find, as they believe it to be the bones of some one who was murdered many years ago and buried under the old hotel to conceal the crime.

Four Thousand Men Discharged. MASON CITY, Iowa, May 31.—Four thousand men have been thrown out of employment on the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul road in the last few days. Superintendent Congrove, of this division, gives no reason for the wholesale discharges of the men under him, saying his orders are mandatory and that higher officials are not likely to explain the action to subordinates. These men are discharged men a saving of \$7,000 a day to the company.

Filed a \$50,000,000 Mortgage. CINCINNATI, May 31.—The filing at Lebanon, Ind., of the \$50,000,000 mortgage of the Big Four property is the result of the big bond issue made in this city May 10. It is simply a formality, and about seventy-five such mortgages have already been filed in counties in Ohio and Indiana through which the Big Four road passes. These mortgages will continue to be filed until one is filed in each of said counties, as required by law.

Knowles & Co. Fail. MILWAUKEE, Wis., May 31.—The stock and commission firm of Knowles & Co. failed today. The firm did a large business. George Knowles, the senior member of the firm, said the cause of the failure was the inability of the firm to collect margins from customers and had been dealing heavily in eastern stocks. The assets and liabilities of the firm could not be stated owing to the tangled condition of affairs.

Horse Killed and Jockey Injured. NEW YORK, May 31.—Twenty thousand persons saw the Metropolitan handicap contested for at Morris park today. A sad accident occurred in the big handicap. Arthur, one of the horses sent to this country from England by Colonel North, the Nitrate King, stumbled and fell, breaking his neck and throwing Jockey Edwards, an English boy, to the ground. The lad's leg was broken.

Found Hanging to a Rope. CHICAGO, May 31.—Charles E. Washburn of Illinois, N. Y., was found dead this morning hanging to a rope at the seminary at College Hill. Washburn was 35 years old and unmarried. Overly brought on melancholy and a mania for suicide, necessitating his removal to the asylum.

In the Hands of a Receiver. LITTLE ROCK, Ark., May 31.—The Little Rock bank at Rock was placed in the hands of a receiver this afternoon. The liabilities are \$25,000, with nearly any assets to meet them.

Overlooked by a Criminal. MEMPHIS, Tenn., May 31.—It is reported that the town of Romeville, Miss., has been wiped off the earth by a cyclone.

Unexpected Termination of a Threatened Kansas City Strike. KANSAS CITY, Mo., May 31.—This morning the Water's union, both white and colored made demands on all restaurant keepers in the city for an increase of wages and shorter hours, threatening a strike if not met. This afternoon the restaurant men held a meeting and as a result at 2 o'clock tonight every restaurant in the city with the exception of two, discharged their waiters, over 300 men being let out. The restaurants are being run tonight with such help as can be

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.

On the evening of the 29th, Charles Nordhoff, correspondent for the New York Herald, was cited to appear before the committee of the government to explain why he had published in the Herald the false charge that a majority of the members of those councils had signed the lottery petitions, whereas not a single one of the present members had done so.